

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

JOSEPH PARKS,

Plaintiff,

v.

**9:08-CV-0586
(TJM/GHL)**

JOSEPH T. SMITH, *et al.*,

Defendants.

**THOMAS J. McAVOY,
Senior United States District Judge**

DECISION & ORDER

I. INTRODUCTION

This *pro se* action brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 was referred by this Court to the Hon. George H. Lowe, United States Magistrate Judge, for a Report and Recommendation pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Rule N.D.N.Y. 72.3(c). In his March 29, 2011 Report-Recommendation, Magistrate Judge Lowe recommended that Defendants' motion for summary judgment (Dkt. No. 51) be granted. Plaintiff has filed objections to this recommendation.

II. STANDARD OF REVIEW

When objections to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation are lodged, the district court makes a “*de novo*” determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” See 28

U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). General or conclusory objections, or objections which merely recite the same arguments presented to the magistrate judge, are reviewed for clear error. Farid v. Bouey, 554 F. Supp. 2d 301, 306 n.2 (N.D.N.Y. 2008); see Frankel v. N.Y.C., 2009 WL 465645 at *2 (S.D.N.Y. Feb. 25, 2009).¹ After reviewing the Report-Recommendation, the Court may “accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge. The judge may also receive further evidence or recommit the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C).

III. DISCUSSION

Having reviewed *de novo* those portions of the Report-Recommendation that Plaintiff has lodged objections to, the Court determines to adopt the recommendations for the reasons stated in Magistrate Judge Lowe’s thorough report.

IV. CONCLUSION

Therefore, the Court **ADOPTS** the recommendations made by Magistrate Judge Lowe in their entirety. Accordingly, it is hereby **ORDERED** that Defendants’ motion for summary judgment (Dkt. No. 51) is **GRANTED** and the remaining claims in this action are

¹ The Southern District wrote in Frankel:


The Court must make a *de novo* determination to the extent that a party makes specific objections to a magistrate’s findings. United States v. Male Juvenile, 121 F.3d 34, 38 (2d Cir.1997). When a party makes only conclusory or general objections, or simply reiterates the original arguments, the Court will review the report strictly for clear error. See Pearson-Fraser v. Bell Atl., No. 01 Civ. 2343, 2003 WL 43367, at *1 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 6, 2003); Camardo v. Gen. Motors Hourly-Rate Employees Pension Plan, 806 F.Supp. 380, 382 (W.D.N.Y.1992). Similarly, “objections that are merely perfunctory responses argued in an attempt to engage the district court in a rehashing of the same arguments set forth in the original [papers] will not suffice to invoke *de novo* review.” Vega v. Artuz, No. 97 Civ. 3775, 2002 WL 31174466, at *1 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 30, 2002).

2009 WL 465645, at *2.

DISMISSED. The Clerk is instructed to enter judgment and close the file in this matter.

IT IS SO ORDERED

Dated: September 9, 2011


Thomas J. McAvoy
Senior, U.S. District Judge